

REMARKS

Claims 13-15, 17-23, and 25 are present in this application. Claims 13, 23, and 25 are independent claims. Claim 24 has been canceled.

Duplicate Claim Objection

The Office Action objects to claim 24 as being substantially identical to claim 25. Applicant has canceled claim 24, and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

§ 103(a) Rejection – Miura, Kurachi

Claims 13-15, 17, and 19-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 04-188190 (Miura) in view of U.S. Patent 5,471,550 (Kurachi). Applicant has amended claims 13, 23 and 25. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the claims as amended.

In the Amendment of December 29, 2008, claims had been amended to recite the step of “adjusting a distance having a larger quantization error caused by the second method with priority, among the distances quantized by the second method.” This “adjusting” feature is described in the present application, for example, as shown in Fig. 8, steps S305 and S309.

The Office Action admits that Miura does not disclose this feature, and instead relies on Kurachi for making up for the deficiency in Miura. In particular, the Office Action alleges that Kurachi at column 7, line 56, to col. 8, line 28, and Fig. 2 can be considered as describing “a system and method wherein one or more segments having the largest quantization error (i.e., larger than a threshold value) are given priority, among the quantized segments, in order to reduce or eliminate the most noticeable errors when quantizing the character outline data.” (Office Action at page 8). Applicant disagrees.

In Kurachi, on the other hand, as evidenced by Fig. 6 and the associated description at column 13, line 56, - column 14, line 17, the straight line segment correction process is performed by determining a maximum offset error (S53), evaluating such an error against a tolerance range (S54), and repeating the process until a desired offset is obtained. Thus, Kurachi

discloses adjustment of distances by a straight line segment correction process rather than generating distances by the second method, as claimed. Furthermore, Kurachi discloses adjustment of any values that exceed a threshold.

In the present application, as shown in Fig. 8, after steps S305 and S309 processing goes back to step S304. In step S305 for example

“the CPU 121 extends the distance, an quantization error of which is largest, among the distances quantized by the second method. Since a distance, an quantization error of which is larger, is extended with priority, the order of the size of the distances is not inverted before and after the quantization.”

After step S305, the sum of quantized distances are again checked.

In other words, following the steps shown in Fig. 8, “priority” in the “adjusting” process means adjusting performed in accordance with the size of the quantization error from largest to smallest. Subsequently, the order of the size of the distances quantized by the second method is not inverted and the balance of the character and/or graphic displayed by the display device can be maintained.

Applicant submits that Kurachi’s teaching of adjusting any values that exceed a threshold without taking into consideration an order of size of the error is not the type of adjustment that is recited in the claims, and does not maintain balance of the character. Applicant has amended claims 13, 23, and 25 to clarify this difference.

For example, claim 13 has been amended to recite:

step (d) includes the step of adjusting a distance having a larger quantization error among all the distances caused by the second method by adjusting all the distances in accordance with the size of the quantization error from largest to smallest, among the distances quantized by the second method.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that Kurachi makes no attempt to maintain the balance of a character, and instead teaches away from maintaining balance.

Kurachi at column 7, lines 11-15, discloses that “it is necessary to correct the offset error and preserve the appearance of the character even though the correction will sacrifice the design intention, that is the desire to provide the line slightly slanted from the predetermined reference line.”

As shown in Fig. 1 of Kurachi, a line which is originally slanted as in figure 1a, undergoing a transformation involving rounding may lead to undesirable dot shifts as shown in figures 1b and 1c. The invention of Kurachi is directed towards eliminating such dot offset errors to preserve the appearance of the character, and will do so even at the cost of changing the design of the character. This is evidenced in figure 8 of Kurachi, which shows a slanted line AB being changed into a vertical line A'B'.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Kurachi fails to make up for the deficiency in Miura, at least for the claims as amended. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

§ 103(a) – Miura, Kurachi, Ogawa

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura and Kurachi in view of JP 07-036434 (Ogawa). Applicant submits that Ogawa does not make up for the above-stated deficiencies in Miura and Kurachi. Accordingly, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claim 18. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at

Application No. 10/556,820
Amendment dated July 7, 2009
After Final Office Action of April 8, 2009

Docket No.: 0717-0545PUS1

the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Down #48222
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant